

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney  
DAVID L. GAPP  
Assistant United States Attorney  
2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401  
Fresno, CA 93721  
Telephone: (559) 497-4000  
  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
DANIEL PERALTA,  
  
Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00166-DAD-BAM  
  
STIPULATION REGARDING EXCLUDABLE  
TIME PERIODS UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT;  
FINDINGS AND ORDER  
  
PROPOSED DATE: August 1, 2022  
TIME: 9:00 am  
COURT: Hon. Dale A. Drozd

This case is scheduled for a status conference on May 25, 2022, but the parties have agreed to move this hearing to August 1, 2022, for a change of plea. On May 13, 2020, this Court issued General Order 618, which suspended all jury trials in the Eastern District of California “until further notice.” Under General Order 618, a judge “may exercise his or her authority to continue matters, excluding time under the Speedy Trial Act with reference to the court’s prior General Order 611 issued on March 17, 2020 . . . with additional findings to support the exclusion in the Judge’s discretion.” General Order 618, ¶ 6 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020). In addition, any judge “may order case-by-case exceptions” to General Order 618’s provisions “at the discretion of that Judge or upon the request of counsel, after consultation with counsel and the Clerk of the Court to the extent such an order will impact court staff and operations.” General Order 618, ¶ 7 (E.D. Cal. May 13, 2020). The court issued General Order 649 on March 29, 2022, which found that public health conditions had not improved significantly and justified an additional ninety-day extension of previous orders related to court proceedings.

1 These orders were entered to address public health concerns related to COVID-19. Although the  
 2 general orders address district-wide health concerns, the Supreme Court has emphasized that the Speedy  
 3 Trial Act’s end-of-justice provision “counteract[s] substantive open-endedness with procedural  
 4 strictness,” “demand[ing] on-the-record findings” in a particular case. *Zedner v. United States*, 547 U.S.  
 5 489, 509 (2006). “[W]ithout on-the-record findings, there can be no exclusion under” § 3161(h)(7)(A).  
 6 *Id.* at 507. Moreover, any such failure cannot be harmless. *Id.* at 509; *see also United States v.*  
 7 *Ramirez-Cortez*, 213 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2000) (explaining that a judge ordering an ends-of-  
 8 justice continuance must set forth explicit findings on the record “either orally or in writing”).

9 Based on the plain text of the Speedy Trial Act—which *Zedner* emphasizes as both mandatory  
 10 and inexcusable—the general orders require specific supplementation. Ends-of-justice continuances are  
 11 excludable only if “the judge granted such continuance on the basis of his findings that the ends of  
 12 justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a  
 13 speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Moreover, no such period is excludable unless “the court sets  
 14 forth, in the record of the case, either orally or in writing, its reason or finding that the ends of justice  
 15 served by the granting of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in  
 16 a speedy trial.” *Id.*

17 The general orders exclude delay in the “ends of justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7). Although the  
 18 Speedy Trial Act does not directly address continuances stemming from pandemics, natural disasters, or  
 19 other emergencies, this court has discretion to order a continuance in such circumstances. For example,  
 20 the Ninth Circuit affirmed a two-week ends-of-justice continuance following Mt. St. Helens’ eruption.  
 21 *Furlow v. United States*, 644 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1981). The court recognized that the eruption made it  
 22 impossible for the trial to proceed. *Id.* at 767-68; *see also United States v. Correa*, 182 F. Supp. 326,  
 23 329 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (citing *Furlow* to exclude time following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks  
 24 and the resultant public emergency).

25 The coronavirus pandemic poses a similar, albeit more enduring, “appreciable difficulty” to the  
 26 prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules. Recently, the Ninth Circuit enumerated a “non-  
 27 exhaustive” list of seven factors it found to be “relevant” in considering ends-of-justice Speedy Trial Act  
 28 continuances “in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.” *United States v. Olsen*, 21 F.4th 1036, 1047

(9th Cir. 2022). That non-exhaustive list includes: (1) whether a defendant is detained pending trial; (2) how long a defendant has been detained; (3) whether a defendant has invoked speedy trial rights since the case’s inception; (4) whether a defendant, if detained, belongs to a population that is particularly susceptible to complications if infected with the virus; (5) the seriousness of the charges a defendant faces, and in particular whether the defendant is accused of violent crimes; (6) whether there is a reason to suspect recidivism if the charges against the defendant are dismissed; and (7) whether the district court has the ability to safely conduct a trial. *Id.*

In light of the societal context created by the foregoing, this court should consider the following case-specific facts in finding excludable delay appropriate in this particular case under the ends-of-justice exception, § 3161(h)(7). When continued, this court should designate a new date for the hearing. *United States v. Lewis*, 611 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010) (noting any pretrial continuance must be “specifically limited in time”).

The coronavirus pandemic poses a similar, albeit more enduring, “appreciable difficulty” to the prompt proceedings mandated by the statutory rules. Recently, the Ninth Circuit enumerated a “non-exhaustive” list of seven factors it found to be “relevant” in considering ends-of-justice Speedy Trial Act continuances “in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.” *United States v. Olsen*, 21 F.4th 1036, 1047 (9th Cir. 2022). That non-exhaustive list includes: (1) whether a defendant is detained pending trial; (2) how long a defendant has been detained; (3) whether a defendant has invoked speedy trial rights since the case’s inception; (4) whether a defendant, if detained, belongs to a population that is particularly susceptible to complications if infected with the virus; (5) the seriousness of the charges a defendant faces, and in particular whether the defendant is accused of violent crimes; (6) whether there is a reason to suspect recidivism if the charges against the defendant are dismissed; and (7) whether the district court has the ability to safely conduct a trial. *Id.*

### STIPULATION

Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel of record, and defendant, by and through defendant’s counsel of record, accordingly stipulate as follows:

1. By previous order this matter was set for a status conference hearing on May 25, 2022. The Court more recently has invited a continuance of this hearing if counsel do not believe that anything

1 substantial can be accomplished at the currently scheduled hearing.

2       2. By this stipulation, the parties agree that the case be scheduled for a change of plea  
3 hearing on August 1, 2022, and to exclude time between May 25, 2022, and August 1, 2022, under 18  
4 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv).

5       3. The parties agree, and request that the Court find the following:

6           a) Counsel for defendant had requested additional time to consult with his client, to  
7 review the current charges and conduct additional investigation and research related to the  
8 charges, to discuss potential resolutions with his client. Given this additional time, counsel has  
9 more recently stated that the defendant intends to plead guilty. The parties will use the time  
10 before August 1, 2022, to finalize and file a written plea agreement.

11           b) Counsel for defendant believes that failure to grant the above-requested  
12 continuance would deny the defense the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation,  
13 taking into account the exercise of due diligence.

14           c) The government does not object to the continuance and joins in the request.

15           d) In addition to the public health concerns cited by General Orders 611 and 612 and  
16 presented by the evolving COVID-19 pandemic, an ends-of-justice delay is particularly apt in  
17 this case because counsel or other relevant individuals have been encouraged to telework and  
18 minimize personal contact to the greatest extent possible. It will be difficult to avoid personal  
19 contact should the hearing proceed.

20           e) Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice are served by continuing  
21 the case as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in a trial within the  
22 original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act. The requested date was the first date on which  
23 the court and the parties were all available to conduct the change of plea hearing.

24           f) For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161,  
25 et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period from May 25, 2022, to August 1,  
26 2022, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i),  
27 (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the request of the  
28 parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action

1 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

2 4. Nothing in this stipulation and order shall preclude a finding that other provisions of the  
3 Speedy Trial Act dictate that additional time periods are excludable from the period within which a trial  
4 must commence.

5 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

6  
7  
8 Dated: May 18, 2022

PHILLIP A. TALBERT  
United States Attorney

9  
10 /s/ DAVID L. GAPPA  
DAVID L. GAPPA  
Assistant United States Attorney

11  
12 Dated: May 18, 2022

13 /s/ ROGER WILSON  
ROGER WILSON  
Counsel for Defendant  
DANIEL PERALTA

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,

v.

DANIEL PERALTA,  
Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00166-DAD-BAM

FINDINGS AND ORDER

PROPOSED DATE: August 1, 2022

TIME: 9:00 am

COURT: Hon. Dale A. Drozd

The Court has reviewed and considered the stipulation filed by the parties on May 18, 2022, and also reviewed the record of this case. The status conference set for May 25, 2022, is vacated. The case is set for a change of plea hearing on **August 1, 2022, at 9:00 a.m. before District Judge Dale A. Drozd.**

For the reasons stated in the stipulation, the period of time from May 25, 2022, to August 1, 2022, inclusive, is deemed excludable under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A) and 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (ii) and (iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the request of the parties on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.  
**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 18, 2022

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE